

CHAPTER V

SOME APPLIED THEOLOGICAL ISSUES ANALYZED BASED ON SOME QUR'ĀNIC STORIES

(The stories of Adam, Noah, Abraham and Moses as the main case studies)¹

In this chapter, we will try to explain and analyze some modern explanations of certain *Qur'ānic* verses related to thinking and ethical issues like the origin of humankind and its development, angels, jinns, prophethood and others. We are going to analyze these issues through the study of the story of Adam, Noah, and Ibrahim (peace be on them). The reasons for the choice of these stories are as follows:

-Firstly, these stories have been the focus of the modernists' studies from various aspects.

-Secondly, the discussion of these stories entails the discussion of most of the other issues, as we are going to see later.

It is important to mention that our study is going to be limited to some writings that are relevant and inclusive of most of these issues and which are characterized by novel analyses. We have excluded writings whose materials go beyond the scope of this research. Our analysis will try to be sufficiently detailed within the scope of this chapter.

¹ Note: This chapter and the next one contain a large number of verses. Therefore, in order to protect the text from fragmentation we will not separate any verse from the main text unless it is three lines and above.

5.1. THE STORY OF ADAM

This story will be studied from the following aspects:

5.1.1. The way Adam was created:

1. According to Muḥammad 'Abū al-Qāsim Ḥāj Ḥamad, the *Qur'ān* distinguished between the selection of Adam among the corrupted people as it is explained in this verse:

“Behold, thy Lord said to the angels: I will create a vicegerent on earth. They said: Wilt Thou place therein one who will make mischief therein and shed blood? Whilst we do celebrate Thy praise and glorify Thy holy (name)? He said: I know what ye know not.”

Sūrah al-Baqarah: 30

And the fact that Allah had created mankind from potter's clay in the beginning of creation.²

He confirms that there are some differences between (*khalq*) creation and the (*ja'ʾl*) making. Creation means to do something new and without following any previous examples. Creation belongs to the world of the unseen. It is only God who can create out of nothing and without imitation, which shows the absoluteness and power of God.

The making (*ja'ʾl*) refers to a development of something existent. It belongs to the world of the seen characterized by constant modification of things, which shows the relative relationship between things. The making is based on mercy.³ The verses in the *Qur'ān* showing this are plentiful. Among them the following:

²Ḥāj Ḥamad, Muḥammad 'Abū al-Qāsim (1996), *al-'Ālamīyyah al-'Islāmīyyah al-Thānīyah*, vol. 1, 2nd. Beirut: Dār 'Ibn Ḥazm for printing and publication, p.96

³*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp.96,473-474.

“It is Allah who causeth the seed-grain and the date stone to split and sprout. He causeth the living to issue from the dead, and He is the One to cause the dead to issue from the living. That is Allah: then how are ye deluded away from the truth? He it is that cleaveth the daybreak (from the dark): He makes the night for rest and tranquillity, and the sun and moon for the reckoning (of time): such is the judgment and ordering of (Him), the Exalted in Power, the Omniscient.”

Sūrah al-ʿAnʿām: 95-96.

Allah in this verse directs our minds to see the natural and relative development of things.

Equally important, the following verse shows the relationship between human beings and the creation of God in that Allah has created the stars not as guidance to us in the dark but as part of the universe. However, it was made as guidance to us. “It is He Who maketh the stars (as beacons) for you, that ye may guide yourselves, with their help, through the dark spaces of land and sea” Sūrah al-ʿAnʿām: 97

However, the following verse: “And cattle He has created for you (men): from them ye derive warmth, and numerous benefits, and of their (meat) ye eat.” Sūrah al-Naḥl: 5 does not show the difference between *creation* and the *making*. This verse can be understood only in its context. The verse before it says:

“He has created the heavens and the earth for just ends: far is He above having the partners they ascribe to Him! He has created man from a sperm-drop; and behold this same (man) becomes an open disputer! And cattle He has created for you (men): from them ye derive warmth, and numerous benefits, and of their (meat) ye eat.”

Sūrah al-Naḥl: 3-5

In the fourth verse, the word (creation) is repeated but not related- using (and)- to the one before it. However, the fifth verse “and the cattle He has created” is

related to the one before it “He has created man”. So, the creation of animals in the fifth verse means their bringing into existence as part of the creation process. It is, then, not related to the benefits that animals provide humans with - such as food and warmth: this is part of the making - but related to the creation of humans, which means the phenomenon of creation as a whole. This is why we can find what is called the optional sign of the stop (فلي) between “and the cattle He has created” and the “from them ye derive”⁴.

Things do not exist in the world as a result of God’s absolute power although He can do that. Things have to follow the process of their *making* in that they start as orders of God, then they are existent in his will, and finally they become things in the world. This process is shown in this verse: “Verily, when He intends a thing, His Command is, (Be), and it is.” Sūrah Yāsīn: 82⁵. The command of God is achieved through a will that ends in things to be done. Thus, *creation* and *making* complement each other in one process that manifests the relationship between the world of the unseen and our world. Nothing, then, can exist without passing through the two worlds as explained by this verse⁶

“Man We did create from a quintessence (of clay); Then We placed him as (a drop of) sperm in a place of rest, firmly fixed; Then We made the sperm into a clot of congealed blood; then of that clot We made a (foetus) lump; then We made out of that lump bones and clothed the bones with flesh; then We developed out of it another creature. So blessed be Allah, the Best to create!”

Sūrah al-Mu’minūn: 12-14.

⁴*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp.473-474.

⁵*Ibid.*, vol.1, p.97.

⁶*Ibid.*, vol.1, p.474.

2. Shuḥrūr, on the other hand, believes that the *making* (*jaʿl*) is a kind of modification during the process of development⁷. As for creation, it is the planning. For example, when we say that the tailor has created a suit out of silk, we mean that the tailor follows a plan before he starts cutting the silk and making its parts. This means that there is a struggle within the created between the shapely (*al-Mukhallaq*) and the shapeless (*Ghayr al- Mukhallaq*). Allah says:

“O mankind! if ye have a doubt about the Resurrection, (consider) that We created you out of dust, then out of sperm, then out of a leech-like clot, then out of a morsel of flesh, partly formed and partly unformed”

Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 5

The existence of these two characteristics within things led to a renewable struggle and contradiction within the lump, which leads to its development into a fetus. This law is behind all the developments of creations from one into the other. In other words, all the creations have undergone the law of evolution and development. It is wrong, then, to say that Allah has created animals like snakes and cats as separate entities and then he provided them with spirit because spirit solely belongs to humans.

In the beginning, humans, animals and plants had the same origin. Then they started to scatter as revealed by this verse: “And in the creation of yourselves and the fact that animals are scattered (through the earth)” Surah al-Jathiyah 4; and as a result of a dialectic operation, their forms started to become different. Non-rational mortals have become rational when they got the spirit; climbing plants

⁷Shuḥrūr, Muḥammad (1990), *al-Kitāb wa al-Qurʾān: Qirāʾah Muʾāsirah*. Damascus: Al-Ahāfi for Printing and Publication, p.152.

were turned into plants and therefore have become independent⁸. As the *Qur'ān* puts it “gardens, with trellises and without” Sūrah al-'An'ām: 141. The history of creation, which lasted millions of years, can be summarized into three stages. Each stage has its darkness as shown in the verse:

“He created you (all) from a single Person: then created, of like nature, his mate; and He sent down for you eight head of cattle in pairs: He makes you, in the wombs of your mothers, in stages, one after another, in three veils of darkness. Such is Allah, your Lord and Cherisher: to Him belongs (all) dominion. There is no god but He: then how are ye turned away (from your true Centre)?”
Sūrah al-Zumar: 6.

The first stage then is the sea darkness, the second stage is the land-sea darkness, and the third stage is land darkness, which refers to the fetus. The existence of humans is within the era of land darkness, which refers to the stage when humans multiplied as a result of intercourse between male and female. This process is the process of the *making* “He created you (all) from a single person” because creation started only with one cell and then multiplied by means of division and not by means of making as shown by this verse⁹ “Verily We created Man from a drop of mingled sperm” Sūrah al-'Insān: 2. Thus, the history of rational humans started with Adam because before Adam there was a type of animal called mortals and Allah had selected Adam from among this type. Adam into whom God breathed His spirit became a human being able to develop and progress. And because Allah did not blow his spirit into the monkeys for example, they were unable to become human. “Allah did choose Adam”. Sūrah 'Āli 'Imrān: 33.

⁸*Ibid.*, pp.226-229.

⁹*Ibid.*, pp.201-202, 280-281.

Adam, then, is the father of the human race (*Jins 'Insānī*) and not the mortal race (*Jins Basharī*). The following equation explains this: mortal + spirit = human¹⁰.

It is not difficult to observe that this thesis, besides being unscientific, contains a contradictory analysis and argument. Therefore, we have chosen to criticize it based on its internal logic.

3. Concerning 'Abū al-Qāsim Hāj Ḥamad, we can refute his arguments from three aspects:

a. He assumes that creation (*khalq*) is different from the making (*Ja'ī*) in that the first is original and not an imitation, while the second is but a modification of something which already exists. In fact, the writer could not avoid contradicting himself by making some of his arguments and analyses contradict the others. For example, he begins by saying that 'creation' does not need to depend on anything existent; however, afterwards he affirms that Allah created the human being from clay.¹¹

Afterwards, claiming to be a specialist who does not miss any point during his analysis, he says:

“It is possible for the specialist of the *Qur'ān* to depend on the verse: ‘And cattle He has created for you (men): from them ye derive warmth, and numerous benefits, and of their (meat) ye eat.’ Sūrah al-Naḥl: 5 - as if he has looked into all the *Qur'ān* and found only this verse- to prove that there is no difference between the two words as Allah uses here created (*Khalaqa*) to imply the relative relationship. In order to explain our methodology of stylistic analysis of the *Qur'ān*, we give this verse as an example:
“He has created the heavens and the earth for just ends: far is He above having the partners they ascribe to Him! He has created man

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.108.

¹¹ Hāj Ḥamad (1996), *al-'Ālamiyyah*, *op. cit.*, vol.1, p.473.

from a sperm-drop; and behold this same (man) becomes an open disputer!"

Sūrah al-Nahl: 3-5.

In the fourth verse, the word (creation) is repeated but not related-using (and) - to the one before it. However, the fifth verse "and cattle He has created" is related to the one before it "He has created man". So, the creation of animals in the fifth verse means their bringing into existence as part of the creation process. It is, then, not related to the benefits that animals provide humans with - such as food and warmth: this is part of the making - but related to the creation of humans, which means the phenomenon of creation as a whole. This is why we can find what is called (stop sign) between "and cattle He has created" and the "from them ye derive"¹².

The writer has attempted to fulfill two aims: To use this verse as evidence against those who might object to his views and to give the reader the impression that what he says is based on solid scientific research.

He thought by saying this that he had weakened any objection against him. He did not know that he revealed more of his contradictions, which are as follows:

- He didn't realize that the objection is not about "and cattle He has created" but about "He has created man from a sperm-drop", the creation of man is from a sperm-drop and not from nothing as he claimed. His claims to follow a scientific methodology are disproved by his saying: for the sake of clarity, in the *Qur'ān* we find what is called the (sign stop) between "and the cattle He has created" and the "from them ye derive". Because he failed to notice that the sign stop is not part of the *Qur'ān* but a proposal of the 'Ulamā during the era of backwardness -as he said- to show the acceptable stops from the unacceptable ones.

¹²*Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.474.

- The *Qur'ān* has many verses which show explicitly that the creation is based on something that already exists. Allah says: "And Allah has created every animal from water" *Sūrah al-Nūr*: 45, "He created man from sounding clay like unto pottery" *Sūrah al-Raḥmān*: 14, "The similitude of Jesus before Allah is as that of Adam; He created him from dust, then said to him "Be": and he was." *Sūrah 'Āli 'Imrān*: 59. Creation, then, is made out of something existent and not out of nothing. Thus, in the first verse, creation is based on water, in the second one, it is based on clay and in the last one it is based on dust. Creation, then, is based on something that already exists. Why, then, did his methodology fail to take these verses into consideration?

b. His claim that Adam was chosen from among the mortal animals is similar to the views of the Magus. As stated by 'Ibn 'Ashūr,

"The Persians claimed that before the human race, there was another race called *Tam* and *Ram*. The Greeks, on the other hand, used to believe that before humans, the earth was full of other creatures called *Bantān*, and that *Ḍafas* which is (Pluto) is the greatest God who chased them out of the earth because of their corruption."¹³

This view goes against what Allah says in many verses among them the following:

"Behold! thy Lord said to the angels: "I am about to create man, from sounding clay, from mud moulded into shape; "When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him."

Sūrah al-Hijr: 29-28

¹³ 'Ibn 'Ashūr, Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir (n.d.), *al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, vol. I. Tunis: al-Dār al-Tūnisīyyah li al-Nashr & Tripoli: Al-Dār al-Jamāhīriyyah li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī' wa al-'I'lān, p.399.

"Behold, the Lord said to the angels: "I am about to create man from clay: "When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him."

Sūrah Ṣād: 71-72

It is clear from these two verses that the dialogue between the angels and God came before the creation of Adam and not after the creation of mortal animals and the corruption they did on the earth. Allah says: "The similitude of Jesus before Allah is as that of Adam; He created him from dust, then said to him "Be": and he was." Sūrah 'Āli 'Imrān: 59. Where are the mortal animals that existed before Adam then?

Moreover, the writer limited his analysis to the verses using the words ('Ādam), mortal (*Bashar*) and excluded the verses using the word human (*'Insān*) although the word human is used more than the word mortal and Adam. Notice: "We created man from sounding clay, from mud moulded into shape" Sūrah al-Hijr: 26, "He began the creation of man with (nothing more than) clay" Sūrah al-Sajdah: 7 "He created man from sounding clay like unto pottery" Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 14

Who is this human ignored by the writer? Is he not the person selected by Allah called Adam?. "O man! What has seduced thee from thy Lord Most Beneficent?" Sūrah al-'Infiṭār: 6. "We have enjoined on man kindness to his parents" Sūrah al-'Aḥqāf: 15. Also, what is his definition of the word (mortal) in the following verses: "She said: "How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me" Sūrah Maryam: 20. "It is not (possible) that a man, to whom is given the Book, and Wisdom, and the Prophetic office, should say to people: Be ye my worshippers rather than Allah's" Sūrah 'Āli 'Imrān: 79.

“Say: I am but a man like yourselves, (but) the inspiration has come to me, that your God is one God” Sūrah al-Kahf: 110.

Is it possible that the word ‘mortal’ here means the mortal animals? If he says so, it will mean that all the people -except the prophets- are mortal animals who have not become humans yet and who are waiting for the Darwinian mutation.

c. His analysis is based on a false understanding of this verse “Verily, when He intends a thing, His Command is, “Be”, and it is!” Sūrah Yāsīn: 82.

According to him, Allah’s ability to do something has to pass through three stages: Order, will, and then realization. He believes that God’s will comes after his order. While in fact, the will comes before the order. If you want something, you will order it and not if you order something, you will want. Otherwise, this will be nonsense. To prove this claim, he also mentioned two more verses: “And Our Command is but a single (Act), like the twinkling of an eye.” Sūrah al-Qamar: 50 and “Verily, all things have We created in proportion and measure.” Sūrah al-Qamar: 49. According to him, while this verse speaks in a general way about how things occur, the second one clarifies the first verse by showing the process of occurrence. He did not explain how the preceding verse could explain the following one. Besides, he uses the context to prove his opinion although he mentioned earlier that this methodology falls short of explaining the *Qur’ān*.

4. Most of the comments leveled at Ḥāj Ḥamad’s analysis could also be made about Shuḥrūr’s. In addition, he could be criticized from two aspects:

a. His claim that the word (make) in the *Qur'ān* means only modification during development can be refuted once by looking at these two verses "And they make into females angels who themselves serve Allah. Did they witness their creation" Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 19 and "so make a tryst between us and thee, which we shall not fail to keep - neither we nor thou - in a place where both shall have even chances." Sūrah Ṭāhā: 58.

The meaning of (make) in the first verse means (believe) that is the non-believers believed that the angels are female. The context shows this as Allah says immediately "they witnessed their creation"¹⁴. Make, in the second verse, means (specify a time for our appointment). If (make) in the first verse meant modification during development, this would mean that the non-believers had changed angels from one state to another. This operation -according to the condition of the writer- would entail that the Angels were firstly unperceived and then they had become perceived because the non-believers modified them. Needless to say, according to him perception occurs only when we have something concrete¹⁵. This modification during development would require millions of years, which would mean that the non-believers had existed before the existence of the angels. This would entail that they had gone through the stage of being one cell, then the stage of animalism, then the stage of mortal, then that of humanism, as it was explained earlier when we mentioned the issue of human creation.

¹⁴ Ibn Kathīr, 'Imād al-Dīn 'Ismā'īl, Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-'Aẓīm, vol. 4. Cairo: Maktabah Dār al-Turāth, p.125.

¹⁵ Shuḥrūr, Muḥammad (1990), *op. cit.*, p.253,267.

b. The writer claims that the three types of darkness in the verse refer to the three phases that the mortal crosses until he becomes a human. This interpretation, first of all, goes against the general context of the verse, which clearly indicates that the creation after creation in the three darkness take place inside the mother's womb "He created you in your mothers' stomachs" - and not outside them, as the writer claims. Secondly, it made him contradict himself as -trying to support his view- he says: "therefore, we believe that the fetus in the mother's womb passes through three stages"¹⁶. He did not know that by saying this, he falls into contradictions that generate other contradictions. The first one is his making the womb of the mother equal to the universe, spacious enough to contain the three stages including the sea and the land. The second contradiction that stems from this logic concerns the duration that the fetus will be inside the mother's womb. The duration must be millions of years since it is separated by 'then' which implies a slow succession¹⁷. This contradiction generates another contradiction which is-for this to be true- the fetus in the first stage must be one cell; the second stage is the stage of coupling. Then, the mortal emerges as a type of animal; then, from this type of animal, God will select 'Ādam, provide him with the spirit and bring him to life, while the rest, comprising monkeys and other types of animals, will stay in the womb since they are not provided with this spirit. We mention this to show the entailments of his analysis as he insists on such by

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p.202.

¹⁷*Ibid.*

saying (since the deed) intervals between these stages are of millions of years, He says: (creation after creation)¹⁸

Since, he adopted Charles Darwin's theory who is for him the best interpreter of the mortal's creation verses¹⁹, he confidentially condemns all those who say that (the three darknesses are the cover of the savior, the cover of the womb and the cover of the stomach)²⁰. The Syrian writer Māhir al-Munajjid had examined Shuhrūr's book and affirmed that:

"This analysis is not based on any scientific evidence or rational proofs and does not have any relationship with any scientific methodology. Thus, it does not respect the mind of the reader unless we assume that the suppositions and imaginations are scientific proofs"²¹

5.1.2. Angels bowing to Adam and Satan's refusal:

Before we start discussing the story's details, it is worth exposing the modernists' conception of Satan.

1. The modernists' conception of Satan. Sayyid Maḥmūd al-Qimnī approaches his view of Satan by retelling an incident mentioned by 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Jibritī the writer of 'Ajā'ib al-'Āthār fī Tarājimi al-'Akhbār. During the French Crusade in Egypt, the French showed some of their chemical experiments to some al-'Azhar Scholars. The latter described those experiments as Satanic experiments²². Thus, he concludes that it is necessary to understand the real nature of Satan

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.106,195.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p.202.

²¹ Al-Munajjid, Māhir (1994), *al-'Ishkāliyyah al-Manhajīyyah fī al-Kitāb wa al-Qur'ān*, 1st ed. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr, p.99.

²² Like the Muslim had never heard about chemistry before that time.

and to see it within a correct framework.²³ Satan, thus, according to him, represents the forces of evil to the primitives: like darkness, Death and Chaos. Each civilization -he affirms- has its own conception of Satan. For the Egyptians, Satan was the god of the desert representing Evil. It was named *Sittī* while *'Uzirīs* represented the god of good. The first one always attempted to undermine the deeds of the second one. In the *al-Rāfidayn* (Iraq) civilization, the case was not different. For them, Satan, manifested in drought and dryness, was involved in a continuous struggle against the god of good manifested in blossom and fertility. With the development of thought and the influence of civilizations on each other, a new conception of the devil emerged. Thus, we find in Islam, Christianity and Judaism, as a result of the dominance of the belief in monotheism, that the conception of the devil has changed from a god of evil into a creature that revolted against God and specialized in the seduction of humans. Thus, he concludes, the Satan mentioned in the *Qur'ān* is the same one deemed to be the god of evil in the old religions. It is only a myth inherited from the religions of the primitives and developed throughout history until it took its current shape²⁴.

2. The fact is that the benefit of this analysis- if it has any benefits – is that it informs us of the kind of weapons he (al-Qimnī) promised to use against his Islamist enemies²⁵. In fact, these weapons are old enough to harm their user more than his enemies.

²³ Al-Qimnī, Sayyid Maḥmūd (1993), *al-'Ustūrah wa al-Turāth*, 2nd ed. Cairo: Sīnā for Publication, p.31.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.32-52.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.20-23,28.

a. The oldness of these weapons is manifested in the writer's use of hypocrisy to spread his ideas. On the one hand, he claims to be a good Muslim as shown in his using expressions confirming his belief in God and showing his love of Him and His prophet, like: Allah- to Him be the Glory -, the holy *Qur'ān*, the prophet - peace on him-. On the other hand he tries to imply that whatever is told by the *Qur'ān* is but myths taken from the traditions of the idol worshipers known before the emergence of Islam. For example, from page 72 to 74, while praising the prophet and the *Qur'ān*, he does his best to show that all that is mentioned in the *Qur'ān* concerning Friday and what was mentioned in *Sūrah al-Takwīr* like the swearing by the stars, and what is mentioned in *Sūrah al-Baqarah* like the story of *Hārūt* and *Mārūt* and other things like the Islamic law of punishment are taken from *Bābiliyyīn* beliefs and reached Islam by means of the Arabs and *Ṣābi'iyyah* who lived before the coming of Islam ²⁶. Allah warns us in many verses against this kind of hypocrisy as shown when someone tries to show his belief in God and his prophets while he acts against Islam because he does not truly believe in it. "He says:" Of the people there are some who say: "We believe in Allah and the Last Day;" but they do not (really) believe" (*Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 8)

"When the Hypocrites come to thee, they say, "We bear witness that thou art indeed the Messenger of Allah." Yea, Allah knoweth that thou art indeed His Messenger, and Allah beareth witness that the Hypocrites are indeed liars."

Sūrah al-Munāfiqūn: 1

b. Besides hypocrisy, the writer's methodology seems to be clearly unsound as shown in his analysis of terms. For example, in page 73 he mentions some

²⁶*Ibid.*, p.72-74.

different opinions about the concept of Satan in the Jewish tradition saying that for the Jews 'Azāzīl is the god of evil which is opposite to *Yahūh* the god of good. Others, believe that 'Azāzīl is a devil that lived in the desert. Later on, he tries to give his own explanation that:

'Azāzīl of the Jews is but the god of *Babylonians Hilāl* (crescent) named *Sīn* and pictured in the form of tīs. Or most probably, he was the god of *tuyūs* symbolized by the *hilāl* because of the similarity between the *hilāl* and the horns of the tīs. This can explain to us why in paintings Satan is always drawn with horns, hoofs (*ḥawāfir*) and tail²⁷.

This quotation exhibits two fallacies:

- He claims that 'Azāzīl belongs to the *Babylonians* without mentioning or explaining this before.
- He made an illogical connection between 'Azāzīl and *Sīn*. According to him, the first symbolizes evil while the latter symbolizes goodness. Immediately afterwards, he denied the existence of two gods for the Jews. He says, "Probably, we do not find lots of Jewish citations of the devil and that's because *Yahūh* was the god of both evil and good. Thus, there was no need for a god of evil."²⁸ Then, he confirmed again that the Jews, being influenced by the Persians, believed in two gods, one symbolizing evil and the other goodness named *'Iblīs* (Satan) abbreviation of the Greek word *Dia-Polos* which is the name of the angel of Death. Moreover, without any scientific proof, he attempts to use its first part-Dia- giving it other meanings created by his wild imagination. He says:

²⁷*Ibid.*, p.37.

²⁸*Ibid.*

"Most probably, the word Dia-Polos has been subjected to great confusion. It is possible that the syllable 'Dia' is derived from Devin which means god; and from Die which means to die and to be cursed; and from 'Deuce' which mean Satan, taking into consideration the similarity between this 'Deuce' and tiyūs in Arabic pronunciation from the *al-kan'ānī* and *al-'Ibrānī* one, and holds the same meaning in Arabic. Bearing in mind the fact that the Greek used to love replacing the names of heroes by Greek names, it is possible that Deus or tīs is the same one named 'Apulu, the god of poetry. Observe that until now, poetry is still believed to be suggested by the devil"²⁹.

It is possible, according to this strange linguistic methodology, to add some other words to this list claiming that they refer to Satan. 'Dia', a pronoun that refers to someone absent in Malay, means 'Satan' since it is wished he were always absent. 'Dear' may refer to the god of good since it means the beloved one. Doe - female deer- might also be the name of god since it looks like the bull and its horns are similar to the crescent. Accordingly, Death is probably the symbol of Satan. According to this unscientific methodology, all these words of different origins and meanings are likely to refer to Satan since they all have the letter 'd' in common.

After all this confusion, he moves from Greece to the south of the Arabic peninsular where (*Sīn*) is believed to be the great god of *Ḥaḍramawt*. Focusing this time on the letter (ن), which means for him a definite article to (سي) means ewe. Joining (*Sī*) to (*N*) produces the word (*Sīn*), which is the name of god 'Tīs' or the 'god bull'. He concludes his research, which lasted one decade,³⁰ by asserting that there is a relationship between (*Sīn*) and

²⁹*Ibid.*, p38.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p.28.

(*Yāsīn*) mentioned in the *Qur'ān* "*Yāsīn*. By the Qur-an, Full of Wisdom" *Sūrah Yāsīn*:1-2. *Yāsīn* is in fact the same as *Sīn* which is the god of Arabs. To prove this, he affirms that until now Egyptian women say: (*Yāsīn* on you) which means for them (name of god on you). The *Qur'ān*, too, swears by things considered to be sacred for Arabs like *al-Jawārī al-Khunnas* (the stars which rise and set)³¹.

According to this methodology, we can also say that (*ʿĪn*) is the name of the god of evil and that its origin is (*ʿĪ*) which means the one who does not clarify his logic, and that (*nūn*) was added to produce (*ʿĪn*) which means the god of evil whose deeds cannot be explained logically, and that Man is unable to grasp the means through which his evil is carried out. Our evidence is not solely based on what Egyptian women believe but also on the belief of plenty of Muslims and non-Muslims both male and female that *ʿĪn* harms people. In the Arab world many people say that this person has been harmed by *ʿĪn* to mean he was subjected to some misfortunes the cause of which are unknown.

c. After all this confusion, the writer contradicts himself by adopting the position that human intellectual development is going backwards. According to him, the primitive's understanding was clearer. They were able to understand natural phenomena better because they were dealing with nature directly³², whereas "The modern man has surrendered to myths and has found it convenient to believe in a god of evil. This belief is a comfort to his mind; it

³¹*Ibid.*, p.115.

³²*Ibid.*, p.32.

helps him to evade (having to) finding out the objective factors controlling his social life”³³.

The writer reveals utmost hate for Islam when he considers these unconnected ancient intellectual myths -as called by John Wilson³⁴- historical facts upon which he judges Islam. In order to have a better understanding of the *Qur’ānic* verses related to Satan based on the modernistic methodology, he urges his readers to refer to Ṣādiq Jalāl al-‘Aẓm³⁵. He says: “This point was well analyzed by Ṣādiq Jalāl al- ‘Aẓm in his book *Naqd al- Fikr al-Dīnī* for those who want more”³⁶.

3. The Communist writer Ṣādiq Jalāl al-‘Aẓm in his explanation of Satan’s story stands on his presumed belief that science and religion are contrastive; and that all the information about unseen things like angels, Adam, Satan and the Day of Judgement are only unscientific myths³⁷. In order to prove this claim, he chooses the story of Satan and tries to prove that it is unrealistic. For him, it is only a symbolic story. He says “When we say that God has chased out Satan from paradise, we should not think that such a story has happened in reality because the implication of this story should be viewed as symbolic and not factual”³⁸. Then, he mentions some verses from the *Qur’ān* which talks about this story: Allah says:

“Behold, Thy Lord said to the angels: "I will create a vicegerent on earth." They said: "Wilt Thou place therein one who will make mischief therein and shed blood? Whilst we do celebrate Thy praise

³³ *Ibid.*, p.36.

³⁴ John A. Wilson et al. (1980), *Māqab al-Falsafah : Al-’Insān fī Mughāmarātihi al-’lūlā*. Jabrāhīm Jabrā (trans.), 2nd ed. Beirut : al-Mu’assasah al-’Arabiyah li al-Dirāsāt wa al-Nashr, p.59.

³⁵ He is a Syrian studied philosophy in Beirut and has worked as university professor in New York, Beirut and Damascus.

³⁶ Al-Qimni (1993), footnote of p.43.

³⁷ Al-‘Aẓm, Ṣādiq Jalāl (1994), *Naqd al-Fikr al-Dīnī*, 7th ed. Beirut: Dār al-Ṭa’lī’ah, pp.12,26-29,52.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p59.

and glorify Thy holy (name)?" He said: "I know what ye know not." And He taught Adam the names of all things; then He placed them before the angels, and said: "Tell Me the names of these if ye are right." They said: "Glory to Thee: of knowledge we have none, save what Thou hast taught us: in truth it is Thou Who art perfect in knowledge and wisdom." He said: "O Adam! Tell them their names." When he had told them, Allah said: "Did I not tell you that I know the secrets of heavens and earth, and I know what ye reveal and what ye conceal?" And behold, We said to the angels: "Bow down to Adam:" and they bowed down: not so Iblis: he refused and was haughty: he was of those who reject Faith."

Sūrah al-Baqarah: 30-34

"Behold! Thy Lord said to the angels: "I am about to create man, from sounding clay, from mud moulded into shape; "When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him." So the angels prostrated themselves, all of them together: Not so Iblis: he refused to be among those who prostrated themselves. (Allah) said: "O Iblis! what is your reason for not being among those who prostrated themselves?" (Iblis) said: "I am not one to prostrate myself to man, whom Thou didst create from sounding clay, from mud moulded into shape." (Allah) said: "Then get thee out from here: for thou art rejected, accursed. "And the Curse shall be on thee till the Day of Judgment."

Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 28-35

The tragedy of Satan, according to the writer, lies in his dilemma to choose between fulfilling God's order and behaving according to His will, that is, Satan could not decide whether to behave according to the absolute duty generated from God's will. The Angels' absolute duty is to observe monotheism towards their Creator. Based on this introduction, he tried to come up with some conclusions, which are introductions for other results. These conclusions are as follows:

- a. Undoubtedly, Satan was in harmony with his great duty towards God when he did not fulfill Allah's ordering him to bow to Adam.

b. If Satan had bowed to Adam, he would have deviated from the true monotheism by forsaking his absolute duty. Allah wants angels to worship Him, and if Satan had bowed to Adam, he would have committed this sin. Thus, Satan's refusal to bow to Adam is the true manifestation of monotheism. Moreover, Satan justified his refusal to bow by affirming two clear proofs:

- He said, "I am not one to prostrate myself to man, whom Thou didst create from sounding clay, from mud moulded into shape", Satan's preference of himself to others does not mean he was arrogant. He just wanted to recall the fact that Allah had chosen not to equate between things in terms of perfection. The universe, accordingly, is put into order according to a specific plan, starting from absolute perfection then going down until nothingness, which is the last level. Therefore, if he had bowed, he would have contradicted the system of the universe because of the fact that fire- from which he was made is better than clay.

- He decided not to bow to Adam because he knew that Adam would do harm on the earth and would shed blood. Therefore, being the leader of the angels, it was irrational for him to bow to Adam³⁹.

c. It is clear now that Satan was only fulfilling God's order and that even when he refused to bow, he was only doing what Allah wants and that all the people are fated to go to either hell or paradise according to God's will and not their will. The question that arises now is why then has God chosen to send prophets with their holy books containing the licit and the illicit and why

people have been instructed to believe that Satan is the source of evil? Is there any attribute that explains this irony? And what is it?

In the *Qur'ān*, we can find many verses which show God's deceit like "And (then unbelievers) plotted and planned, and Allah too planned, and the best of planners is Allah." *Sūrah 'Āli 'Imrān* : 54.

According to him, Allah deceived Satan⁴⁰ by explicitly ordering him to bow to Adam, while in fact, He wanted him to refuse to bow so that He could have an excuse to do whatever He wanted against him and execute his fate on him. Thus, God's test of Satan was only a tool of deceit used to justify His will (what he wants to do) to His people so that it would be accepted by them and they would not have any room for protest against what he does to them⁴¹.

In the end, after such twists and turns, the writer emphasized that Satan is a clean hero whose tragedy will finally come to a happy ending⁴². Thus, he advises us to stop insulting him reminding us that he is an angel. He says, " I believe that firstly, we have to change significantly our traditional conception of Satan, his personality and his status. Secondly, we have to re-elevate him to the status of an angel who serves His God faithfully and devotionally and fulfills God's commands with exactness and great care. Finally, we have to stop insulting him, forgive him and ask forgiveness for him. We have to urge people to be good to him after we have accused him falsely of being the culprit behind every bad deed⁴³.

³⁹*Ibid.*, pp.59-63.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, pp.78-81.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, p.81.

⁴²*Ibid.*, p.84.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p.85.

4. It is evident that this analysis, besides being mere presumptions and conjectures that bind, in the end, only him, is based on many methodological fallacies both in terms of form and content, which shows the writer's ill intention and misuse⁴⁴.

a. On the level of form, the writer uses rhetoric and poetic fallacies, which are used only by the losers who are mentally sick and blinded by fanaticism. They resort to such techniques to evade the truth.

- The first fallacy is that he based his argument on a false presumption that states that Islam contradicts science. This allegation can be proven false based on two pieces of evidence: Firstly, if we agree with him on the same definition of science, there are many facts that show that Islam is not against science and human knowledge. On the contrary, there are many verses from the *Qur'ān* and sayings of the prophet which urge people to contemplate and meditate on the wonders found both within ourselves and in our world, such as:

“And among His Signs is this, that He created for you mates from among yourselves, that ye may dwell in tranquillity with them, and He has put love and mercy between your (hearts): verily in that are Signs for those who reflect. And among His Signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the variations in your languages and your colours; verily in that are Signs for those who know. And among His Signs, He shows you the lightning, by way both of fear and of hope, and He sends down rain from the sky and with it gives life to the earth after it is dead: verily in that are Signs for those who are wise.”

Sūrah al-Rūm: 21, 22, 24.

⁴⁴al Yāsin, Muḥammad Ḥasan (1987), *Hawāmish 'alā Kitāb Naqd al-Fikr al-Dīnī*, 7th edn. Beirut: Dār al-Nafā'is, p.67.

Islam, then, does not oppose science but encourages it and elevates those seeking it. Allah says: "Allah will raise up, to (suitable) ranks (and degrees), those of you who believe and who have been granted Knowledge. And Allah is well-acquainted with all ye do." Sūrah al-Mujādalah: 11.

Islam even asserts that those who seek science and knowledge are indeed the people who fear Him:

"Seest thou not that Allah sends down rain from the sky? With it We then bring out produce of various colours. And in the mountains are tracts white and red, of various shades of colour, and black intense in hue. And so amongst men and crawling creatures and cattle, are they of various colours. Those truly fear Allah, among His Servants, who have knowledge: for Allah is Exalted in Might, Oft-Forgiving."

Sūrah Fāṭir: 27-28

Maurice Bucaille confirms this fact. He says:

"In this context, the text of the Qur'an and the data of modern embryology are strikingly similar. All these statements agree with today's firmly established facts. But how could the men living at the time of Muhammad have known so many details of embryology? For these data were not discovered until a thousand years after the Qur'anic revelation had taken place. The history of science leads us to conclude that there can be no human explanation for the existence of these verses in the Qur'an."⁴⁵

It is clear that the *Qur'ān* goes along with science and rationality. Besides, Islam even preserves our brain and protects it from all that prevents it from performing its function such as drugs and wine, which is threatening humanity nowadays and only good Muslims are safe from them.

Moreover, the history of Islamic civilization shows that Muslims have respected science and taken care of it. Muslims have been brilliant in algebra,

⁴⁵Maurice Bucaille (1982), *What is the Origin of Man?*. Alstair D. Pannel & the Author (trans.), 8th edn. Paris: Seghers, p.188.

medicine, architecture, astronomy, mechanics, history, social sciences and other scientific fields. Some of them have Arabic names because they were invented by Muslims, like Algebra, which is derived from the word Jabara (reunite, restore'). This is testified even by non-Muslims⁴⁶. Secondly, after he asserts that Islam and science are not in agreement, he contradicts himself by asserting that both religion and science are unable to provide scientific explanations of the first source of the universe. He says, "In fact, we have to admit humbly that we are ignorant of anything related to the first source of the universe"⁴⁷. Since he denies knowing anything about the source of the universe, how then can he claim that what the *Qur'ān* says about Satan is but a myth? The fact that someone is unable to know something does not give him the right to deny it. It is against the principles of science to deny something before it is examined thoroughly. If we used the writer's methodology and adopted his materialistic point of view that recognizes only what is concrete and ignores everything that we lack the tools to use in order to understand it, science would not develop. This is because the denial of something before having the ability to deny it or to confirm it is a denial of the ability to deny it or to confirm it before denying it or confirming it. The problem, then, is not about denying simply the existence of God and his angels but also about the philosophy of the methodology that could be subjected to confinement once this reduction point of view is adopted. This is because even science has its

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p.218. Ernest G. McClain (1981), *Meditations through the Qur'an*. U.S.A.: Nicolas Hays, Inc, p.8.

⁴⁷ al-'Azm (1994), *op. cit.*, p.20.

supernatural contemplation, without which science would lose one of its basic features and structures.⁴⁸

- What he says about myths suggests that myths are related to our reality and not mere illusion and imagination; and that they have a civilizational function both in the past and the present. He believes that myths provide us with answers to big issues such as Death, evil, the source of things, their objectives and their meanings⁴⁹. "Therefore, the theological thought has always constituted a civilizational force from which religious thought, philosophical contemplation and the expression of art ladles continuously"⁵⁰. If this is the role of the myth, its nature and its functional value that cannot be replaced either by science or others, why does the writer then ridicule the beliefs of people? Why did he choose to raise all these issues and make people preoccupied by them instead of their real problems, which the writer claims to do his best to solve?⁵¹.

b. On the level of content, the write has been selective and scientifically untrustworthy:

- Selectivity: he judges Islamic thought based on his study of a limited set of books that misrepresent it. His understanding is mainly based on the writings of certain Sufis known for their deviation from the right path like al-Hallāj. The Sufis' books, as is known in the scientific circles, do not represent

⁴⁸B. N. Ghosh (1987), *Scientific Method and Research*, 4th ed. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited, p.5.

⁴⁹al-'Azmi (1994), *op. cit.*, pp.57-58.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p.,58.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, pp.10,13.

the true Islamic thought and manifest instead- as the writer admits- personal experiences and private convictions⁵². He, himself, is doubtful that they might be convincing and sufficient⁵³. The book that could be used as an authentic source of Islamic thought is the commentary of the al-Tabarī. However, the writer chooses to narrate a lot of fabricated lies⁵⁴ which Jalāl al-'Aẓm - because of his ignorance and fanaticism - considers truths based on which he attacks Islam. The Iraqi Scholar, al-Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥasan 'Āl Yāsīn in his comments about the writer (Sādiq Jalāl al-'Aẓm) says: " the writer has requested that any critic of (him) must stand on strong and deep foundations, and that he should show scientific composure and a spirit of unbiased criticism. Did he apply this on himself or are daydreams solid scientific foundations?"⁵⁵.

- The lack of the writer's scientific trust can be seen in his twisting of the verses to make them give meanings they do not imply. For example, he asserts that Satan was the leader of the angels⁵⁶, Based on this presupposition, he draws the wrong conclusion and makes Satan a hero in this drama⁵⁷. In what verse is it mentioned that Satan was the leader of the angels? Is it part of scientific trust to fabricate lies about Islam and then judge it according to these lies? Would it not be better for the writer to get rid of his fanaticism so that he could see that the verses do not mean what he thinks? Moreover, the

⁵²*Ibid.*, p.49.

⁵³*Ibid.*

⁵⁴'Āl Yāsīn (1987), *op. cit.*, pp.63,65.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p.65.

⁵⁶al-'Aẓm (1994), *op. cit.*, pp.64,81.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p.69.

writer keeps contradicting himself, for example, on page 61, he asserts that Satan refused to bow because of his conviction that to do so would lend to polytheism⁵⁸. We do not know which expression the writer found in the *Qur'ān* that shows that responding to Allah's commands leads to polytheism. If bowing to Adam had meant polytheism, the angels would have been considered to have committed polytheism because they responded to God's command.

After this, he changed his mind and asserted that Satan was powerless in all that happens to him, thus depriving him of the most important characteristic of heroism which is freedom. He "affirms that Satan was forced by his wisdom and subdued by his⁵⁹ will"⁶⁰. In other words, "Satan was the making of God's will submissive to its rules and the fulfiller of its requirements.... Become null and void for him the do's and don'ts"⁶¹. "He was, therefore, a faithful fatalist".⁶²

There is no reason for this "clowning of which objective research and scientific method are innocent"⁶³ except the desire to condemn Islam and raise suspicion about it. He does not seek the truth, as he already believes that Islam is against science. He clearly expresses his aim to do so when he says: "Are we able to deny that God who died in Europe is near to death everywhere as a result of the influence of scientific

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.61-63.

⁵⁹ He refers (his) here to Allah.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p.71.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p.78.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 84.

⁶³ al Yāsīn (1987), *op. cit.*, p.65.

knowledge, technological development, rational methods to seek knowledge and revolutionist tendencies in society and economy".⁶⁴

5.1.3. The names learned by Adam - peace on him -:

1. According to 'Abū al-Qāsim Ḥāj Ḥamad, when Allah addressees the Angels.

"Behold, thy Lord said to the angels: "I will create a vicegerent on earth." They said: "Wilt Thou place therein one who will make mischief therein and shed blood? Whilst we do celebrate Thy praise and glorify Thy holy (name)?" He said: "I know what ye know not."

Sūrah al-Baqarah: 30

Adam was not created yet. The angels' protest was against the behavior of animal mortals existing at that moment thinking that Allah would choose the *khalifah* from among them. When Allah created Adam from mortal parents and breathed His spirit into him, he taught him the Names and made him stand in front of the angels " And He taught Adam the names of all things; then He placed them before the angels, and said: "Tell Me the names of these if ye are right." Sūrah al-Baqarah: 31. The word "right" refers to the angels' belief that Adam would do harm on the earth. God then, showed them by the use of the names that Adam was different from what they used to know about the behavior of mortal animals. So, what are these names? These names are the names mentioned in Sūrah al-Nisā': 23, "Prohibited to you (for marriage) are: your mothers". The evidence supporting this is as follows:

- a. The pronoun in the verse concerns something that already exists (*'Araḍahum*) (showed them), which means the sensual and factual existence

⁶⁴ al-'Azmi (1994), *op. cit.*, p.19.

and not the conceptual existence, for which it should be said (‘*Araḍahā*) (showed it) to refer to the names themselves.

b. The things exposed were not human creatures, natural phenomena, materials or deeds. The angels knew that earlier; and it is not a proper noun since the angels know the names of everything. However, the names unknown to the angels are *maḥmūl* (common nouns) related to status, and position; they are names that refer to general things "And He taught Adam the names of all things" Sūrah al-Baqarah: 31. For- example 'Eve' is a proper noun and it is a woman. This entails her being a wife. Wife is a common noun. 'Eve' is a proper noun while the noun 'wife' showing her status is a common noun. Similarly, the names of offspring both male and female are proper nouns while their status is son and daughter respectively. 'Son' and 'daughter' are common nouns. The common nouns then, showing the status of things, are the names learned by Adam and not others as mentioned by theologians and others.⁶⁵

2. In short, it is clear that the writer does not have any criterion with which he could tackle the texts. He confuses linguistic terminology with logical terminology. The following remarks show the writer's uncertainty and confusion and the fact that he lacks a clear methodology to understand the language and the logic:

a. He mentions that the pronoun in ‘*Araḍahum* (showed them) refers to something that is existent and not conceptual - maybe he means rational - and

⁶⁵Hāj Hāmad (1996), *al-‘Ālamiyyah*, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp.102-104.

not something conceptual and linguistic – names - or else he would have said ‘*Araḍahā*’ (he showed it). Then, he affirmed that this thing shown is not a human being or a natural phenomenon or deed, which means it’s not concrete. What is it then? The writer gives us an unscientific answer when he says: "those shown to the angels were described by common nouns that show their status. This status differentiates them from those who do harm on the earth and shed blood in terms of identity and characteristics. Therefore, the names were not of stone and trees as mentioned in the Jewish tradition but of human status"⁶⁶.

After concluding that those exposed to the angels are different from those who did harm on earth⁶⁷, he contradicts himself by saying "Adam defined those exposed to the angels with common nouns surely because of their harm on the earth"⁶⁸.

b. The writer has proved that he does not have any clear methodology to understand the Arabic language or logic.

- From the linguistic aspect, he argued that if the pronoun in ‘*araḍahum*’ refers to the conceptual, he would have said ‘*araḍahā*’, that is by using the singular female pronoun. The pronoun then refers to something concrete and real. Moreover, he denies previously that this thing is human or a natural phenomenon, then what is it? This contradiction is very clear.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.103.

⁶⁷*Ibid.* He said: "those whom exposed to angels are characterized with special adjectives that certain their state, which distinguish them from the state of those who harm on the earth and shed blood. It is a difference in nature and characters".

⁶⁸*Ibid.*

However, it seems that the writer has heard or memorized something without understanding its meaning. The linguists, after they scrutinized the Arabic language, found that the pronoun used for the plural third party (they) (*jami' al-mudhakkir al-ghā'ib*) refers only to a plural rational male. This can be seen in *Qur'ānic* verses like: "*Rijālun lā tulhīhim tijāratun wa lā bay'un 'an dhikri al-'Allāh*" "By men whom neither traffic nor merchandise can divert from the Remembrance of Allah" *Sūrah al-Nūr*: 37. Whereas, for the non-rational, Allah said: "*Wa al-Jibāla 'arsāhā*" "And the mountains hath He firmly fixed" *Sūrah al-Nāzi'āt*: 32 not *'arsāhum*, we can even say that except in the *Qur'ān* *'arsāhunna* (And the mountains hath He firmly fixed) - them here refers to the plural absent female - without having any relation with the fact that it has to be concrete or conceptual.

- From the logical aspect, he disconnects the essence of things and their manifestation. He says that what was exposed to the angels were common nouns (*'asmā' maḥmūlāt*). He depends on the distinction between proper nouns (*'ism al-'alam*) and predicate (*al-maḥmūl*) on Maḥmūd Fahmī Zaydān's book on the philosophy of language. When I referred to the book, I found that the writer had misunderstood three things mentioned by Fahmī Zaydān and taken from Frija and Russel proposed to differentiate proper nouns from the predicate (*maḥmūl*) in the logical theory:

- The proper noun gives meaning without being in need of others, whereas, the predicate is general. It needs a proper noun to explain its meaning.

- The words that refer to quantifiers like (all); (some) do not have any meaning if attached to a proper noun while they have meaning if attached to a predicate.
- To understand proper nouns, we have to be aware of their referent either by seeing or reading while the predicate is used to refer to things to show a fact or an issue⁶⁹. Due to this misunderstanding, he committed two silly mistakes: First, he used the term 'common nouns' instead of predicate. The second one is used to include general nouns like 'man', the quality like hardworking and the verb - which does not require a direct object - like 'to walk'⁷⁰ while the term used by the writer- common noun- includes only general names. Second, his remarks are limited to only the relationship (predicate theorem), which consists of proper nouns and a predicate. He did not look into others relationships between the expression's part of speech, for example, the dual relation found in expressions like 'Aḥmad is taller than 'Amr, three relations found in expressions like Zayd gave money to 'Amr , and four relations like Zayd sent a message to 'Amr through the post office' All these expressions are possible relationships and not one status⁷¹.

Moreover, even if we assume that the Arabic language accepts the application of such philosophical theory, is then God's saying, " And He taught Adam the names of all things; then He placed them before the angels, and said: "Tell Me the names of these if ye are right." Sūrah al-Baqarah: 31 an issue of status so that it is right to talk about

⁶⁹Zaydān, Maḥmūd Fahmī (1985), *Fī Falsafah al-Lughah*. Beirut: Dār al-Nahḍah al-'Arabiyyah li al-Tibā'ah wa al-Nashr, p.13-14.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, p.12.

⁷¹*Ibid.*

predicate and proper nouns? The strange thing is the writer's assumption and certainty that the *Qur'ān* means by 'Name' the common noun and not the proper noun⁷².

5.2. THE STORY OF NOAH

5.2.1. 'Abū al-Qāsim Ḥāj Ḥamad:

'Abū al-Qāsim Ḥāj Ḥamad concludes from the story of Noah the following assumptions:

1. He denies that Noah had offspring and consequently he denies the superiority of the Semites to other races.
2. He asserts that the Babel civilization was very developed in various scientific fields like astronomy and psychology. It was developed as a result of angels' cooperation with humans.
3. Noah's people were scientifically developed. They were well-versed in physics, astronomy and mathematics. They understood how creation happened, and they knew the characteristics of the moon and the sun. They also understood the origins of creation. The evidence that shows these miraculous achievements is the fact that Noah's construction of the ship lasted 50 years. Still his people did not perceive this achievement as abnormal. All these civilizations are still enigmatic in the history of mankind.
4. He denies that Noah had any offspring and that what he thought to be his son, Allah showed that it is not true. Allah kept His promise to save the family of

⁷²Ḥāj Ḥamad (1996), *al-'Ālamiyyah*, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p.103.

Noah but did not save what Noah thought to be his son. Allah explained to him that the one he thought to be his son was, in fact, born out of wedlock.

“Allah sets forth, for an example to the Unbelievers, the wife of Noah and the wife of Lut: they were (respectively) under two of our righteous servants, but they were false to their (husbands), and they profited nothing before Allah on their account, but were told: "Enter ye the Fire along with (others) that enter!"”

Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 10.

He concludes from this story that it is illicit to adopt children and shows its disadvantages. He mentions three stories to prove the bad consequences of adoption. These stories are as follows:

a. The story of Noah whose son refuses to follow his father though he had called him for centuries. He did not sympathize with his father simply because there was no blood relationship between them.

b. The story of the prophet Mohamed with his adopted son - Zaid - shows that the prophet could not psychologically deal with him in the family context except through keeping what he felt secret.

c. The story of the prophet Joseph with the wife of the 'Azīz shows that - though she was in the position of his mother in terms of adoption - in the end they could not control themselves and felt temptation towards each other⁷³.

Shuḥrūr agrees with him in the fact that what Noah thought to be his son was not really his but he was born out of fornication. Therefore, the promise of Allah is true, as the one who drowned was not his true son; he was born out of wedlock without the knowledge of Noah. Thus, Noah's amazement was normal and the answer of God was that he does not know this fact. Allah says:

⁷³*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp.89-96.

He said: "O Noah! he is not of thy family: for his conduct is unrighteous. So ask not of Me that of which thou hast no knowledge! I give thee counsel, lest thou act like the ignorant!"

Sūrah Hūd: 46⁷⁴.

5. He explained that the standing in Arafat and the hastening onward is a celebration of Noah's standing in Arafat. This celebration is meant to give meaning to the concept of time and to show its perfection in the *Qur'ān*. The following explanation proves according to him this fact:

a. The terminological evidence seen in God's saying, " And say: "O my Lord! Enable me to disembark with Thy blessing: for Thou art the Best to enable (us) to disembark" Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 29. Allah here is commanding the prophet Noah- peace on him- to pray to get a blessed place. This is in agreement with the blessed place mentioned by God: "The first House (of worship) appointed for men were that at Bakka; full of blessing and of guidance for all kinds of beings" Sūrah 'Āli 'Imrān: 96. In order not to confuse this holy place with other holy places, Allah commands His prophet to hasten onwards during pilgrimage like the people did before. He says:

"It is no crime in you if ye seek of the bounty of your Lord (during pilgrimage). Then when ye pour down from (Mount) Arafat, celebrate the praises of Allah at the Sacred Monument, and celebrate His praises as He has directed you, even though, before this, ye went astray. Then pass on at a quick pace from the place whence it is usual for the multitude so to do, and ask for Allah's forgiveness. For Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful."

Sūrah al-Baqarah: 198-199.

⁷⁴Shuḥrūr (1990), *op. cit.*, p.360.

According to the writer, who are those people if not the people of Noah? For the writer this proves further that we are following Noah's people when we stand in Arafat.

b. The most important evidence is the likeness between Noah's boarding on the ship and our standing in Arafat in terms of the timing. We stand on the second half of the 9th of *Dhī al-Hijjah*. The second half is the end of a day and the 9th day is the end of a decade. Similarly, Noah remained in life 950. To understand this, we have to understand counting based on *Sanah* (year based on sun counting) and exception based on *'Ām* (year based on moon counting). *Sanah* (year) is derived from *tasannah* (rotted) things because of effect of the sun, Allah says: "Nay, but thou hast tarried for a hundred years. Just look at thy food and drink which have rotted not!" Sūrah al-Baqarah: 259. *Sanah* refers to counting using the calendar months while *A'am* refers to counting using the lunar months. As the *Qur'ān* says: "So they stayed in their Cave three hundred years, and (some) add nine (more)." Sūrah al-Kahf: 25. Each 300 calendar year equals 309 lunar years. This means an addition of 3 years for each 100 years. The mathematical operation that explains this is as follows:

950 calendar years + (50 lunar years which equals 48 1/2 calendar years) = 998 1/2 calendar years).

This means that there was one and a half years left for Noah to ride in his ship. This is exactly the time we stand on *'Arafāt* when we shorten *Zuhur* and *'Asr* prayer. By the end of this time, Noah's people went down from the ship

and hastened onward from the hill of *'Arafāt* heading towards *al-Mash'ar al-Ḥarām*. Likewise we have been ordered to do so after them, "Then pass on at a quick pace from the place whence it is usual for the multitude so to do" *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 199⁷⁵

5.2.2. Assessment:

We will criticize this analysis on two points:

1. The two writers have denied the fact that Noah had any offspring. Their evidence is found in Allah's saying " He said: "O Noah! he is not of thy family: for his conduct is unrighteous." *Sūrah Hūd*: 46. They understood from it that the one Noah called his son is not his real son but an illegitimate son of his wife with someone else. It is clear that the two writers have shown that they are suffering from methodological confusion in their analysis as they have shown many times before. This is for two reasons:

- a. They limited their analysis to only one reading of the verse when there is another reading which prevents us from deducing any wrong meaning or from having any doubts about the intended implication of the first verse. The first reading is Allah's " *'innahu 'amalun ghayru ṣāliḥ* (He is of evil conduct)" with *Fath al-Mīm* and *tanwīn al-lām wa raf'i ghayr*. The second reading is *'innahu 'amila ghayra ṣāliḥin* (he committed evil conduct) with *kasr al-mīm wa naṣbi ghayr* as a direct object. Here the meaning is clear that the one who committed evil conduct was the son of Nūh.

⁷⁵ Ḥāj Ḥamad (1996), *al-'Ālamiyyah*, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp.224-226.

This argument is valid if we suppose that the writer recognizes the existence of many readings. However, he does not. He considers them as the *kashkashāt* of the Arabs⁷⁶, which means that he challenges the accuracy of the *Qur'ān*. This is because the reading he depended on for his argument - the reading of *Ḥafṣ* quoted from 'Āṣim - is not more authentic than the others are, as it is agreed that all of them have been narrated by *tawātur* (succession). If we take for example the word *sāri'ū* (speed up) in 'Āli 'Imrān, while Nāfi' and 'Ibn 'Āmir read it without (*wāw*) (and) before (*sīn*) (*sāri'ū*), the others Qurra' read it with (*wāw*) (and) before (*sīn*)⁷⁷. Which reading could the writer consider the right one and on what basis? To refuse one of these readings is actually a refusal of the *Qur'ān* itself because they are all equal in their status as the same methodology was used in all of them. Someone may object by suggesting that the correct reading could be found in the Ottoman *Maṣḥif*. However, even the Ottoman *Maṣḥif* carries the same differences, to challenge any of these different readings is actually to challenge the accuracy of the *Qur'ān* itself because they are the *Qur'ān*. The Muslim has to follow one and believe the others to be authentic.

b. The writer failed to keep his promise that his methodology would be based on looking into the *Qur'ān* as a whole, which means considering all the verses, which are relevant to the topic. He limited his analysis to the verses, which confirm his thesis while ignoring the others. Among these verses is

⁷⁶Ḥaj Ḥamad, Muḥammad 'Abū al-Qāsim (1991), *Manhajīyyah al-Qur'ān al-Ma'rifiyyah*. USA: International Islamic Institute of Thought (IIIT), p.69.

⁷⁷Al-Qādī, 'Abd al-Fattāḥ (1981), *al-Budūr al-Zāhirah fī al-Qirā'āt al-'Ashr al-Mutawātirah* 1th ed. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, p.70.

Allah's saying "and address Me not in favour of the wrongdoers; for they shall be drowned in the Flood." Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 27 which shows that Nūḥ begged for God's mercy on his son, as it is shown in Sūrah Hūd previously mentioned. Also, Allah's saying,

"At length, behold! There came Our Command, and the fountains of the earth gushed forth! We said: "Embark therein, of each kind two, male and female, and your family - except those against whom the Word has already gone forth - and the Believers." But only a few believed with him".

Sūrah Hūd: 40

This verse shows that some members of Nūḥ's family were punished and destroyed because of their disbelief in God (and the Believers. But only a few believed with him.). Concerning the verse from Surah al-Taḥrīm which the writer used to prove that Nūḥ's wife and Lūt's wife committed the sin of adultery is clarified by the following verse:

"Then we evacuated those of the Believers who were there, but We found not there any just (Muslim) persons except in one house: And We left there a Sign for such as fear the Grievous Penalty"

Sūrah al-Dhāriyāt:35-37

'Ibnu 'Āshūr explains this verse clearly by saying "And the verse shows that Lūt's wife pretended to be submissive to her husband and hid her disbelief and supported her people's corruption, Allah says:

"Allah sets forth, for an example to the Unbelievers, the wife of Noah and the wife of Lut: they were (respectively) under two of our righteous servants, but they were false to their (husbands), and they profited nothing before Allah on their account, but were told: "Enter ye the Fire along with (others) that enter!"

Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 10.

Lūt's family members were all Muslims but not all believers. For this, only those who had the attributes of belief and Islam were saved." ⁷⁸

2. The writer's claim that the standing in Arafat and the hastening onwards is a celebration of Noah's standing in Arafat and his hastening onward. He supported this claim with three pieces of evidence:

a. The word describing the place where Nūḥ was asked to stand is the same word describing *Bakkah* (Makkah). This, according to him, is proof that the place where Nūḥ reached is Makkah and more exactly 'Arafāt. The writer failed to see that 'Arafāt is not part of the holy Makka.

b. He mentioned this evidence to remove any doubt about his claim that the place that Noah descended in is Makkah. He concluded this from this verse:

"Then when ye pour down from (Mount) Arafat, celebrate the praises of Allah at the Sacred Monument, and celebrate His praises as He has directed you, even though, before this, ye went astray. Then pass on at a quick pace from the place whence it is usual for the multitude so to do, and ask for Allah's forgiveness. For Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful."

Sūrah al Baqarah: 198-199

According to him, the people mentioned in this verse refer to Nūḥ's people.

He asserts that we have been commanded to hasten onward like them.

However, He forgot that 'Arafāt - where Nūḥ descended - and holy Mecca (the blessed place) are different⁷⁹. The people mentioned in the above verse

are some Arabic tribes who performed their special pilgrimage before Islam.

It was said also that (people) refer to 'Ibrāhīm - peace on him -. It is common

⁷⁸ Ibn 'Ashūr, al-Ṭāhir, *op. cit.*, vol. 27, p.8.

⁷⁹ This does not mean that I am showing disrespect to 'Arafah; my aim is to give evidence that supports my argument. It is a fact that Mecca described of blessing is not 'Arafah that in where the writer claims that the prophet Nūḥ had descended.

among the Arabs to address one using the plural: like Allah's saying (O ye messengers! enjoy (all) things good and pure, and work righteousness: for I am well-acquainted with (all) that ye do.) Sūrah al Mu'minūn: 51. The one addressed in this verse is only the prophet Mohamed-peace on him.⁸⁰

c. He assumed that this evidence is so exact and clear that it undoubtedly confirms his claim. He used both terminological and mathematical signs. On the terminological level, he differentiates between (*Sanah*) and (*'Ām*) (year) based on the word (*yatasannah*) in 'Allāh's saying, (but look at thy food and thy drink; they show no signs of age - لم يسنه -) Sūrah al-Baqarah: 259.

He connects (*tasannah*) which means modification as a result of the sun's movement. He asserts that (*sanah*) (year) is used for sun calculation and (*'ām*) for moon calculation. He connects this with Allah's saying, "So they stayed in their Cave three hundred years, and -some- add nine -more-.) Sūrah al-Kahf: 25. He claims to conclude like some other scholars before him- such as al-Qurtubī⁸¹ - that 300 calendar years equal 309 lunar years. We do not intend to raise any objection even though it is arguable that '*ām* refers to lunar months. Allah says: (Joseph said: For seven years (*sinīn*) shall ye diligently sow as is your wont: and the harvests that ye reap, ye shall leave them in the ear, except a little, of which ye shall eat) Sūrah Yūsuf: 47. And also said: (Then will come after that (period) a year (*'ām*) in which the people will have abundant

⁸⁰ Al-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad 'Ibn Jarīr (1969), *Jāmi' al-Bayān wa Ta'wīl al-Qur'ān*, vol. 1, 3rd ed. Egypt: Sharikah Maktabah wa Maṭba'ah Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī wa 'Awlāduh, pp.293-294.

⁸¹ Al-Qurṭubī, Muḥammad 'Ibn 'Aḥmad al-'Anṣārī, *al-Jāmi' li 'Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*, vol. 10. Beirut: Mu'assas Manāhil al-'Irfān, p.387.

water, and in which they will press -wine and oil-) Sūrah Yūsuf: 49. Allah used the word *sanah* and 'ām,' to refer to the same thing.

What we intend to oppose is this mathematical calculation and his false conclusion that the standing in Arafat is on the same day Nūḥ -peace on him- stood. He was wrong on the following things:

- Who informed him that it took Nūḥ 50 years to make his ship?
- How did he know that the ninth day is the end of a decade? A decade is 10 years while numbered decades start with 10 and finish at 90⁸². There is a difference between nine and ninety. It seems that he confused the *Jam' al-Qillāh* that starts with 3 and ends with 9 with the decade.
- Even if we assume that his previous claim was correct, the standing on 'Arafāt is on the second half of the ninth day of *Dhī al-Hijjah* month while Nūḥ's descending was at the end of the second half of the 10th century which agrees with the end of the second half of the 10th day of *Dhī al-Hijjah* month. It is clear that this is quite different from what the writer mentions.

5.3. THE STORY OF 'IBRAHIM

5.3.1. 'Abū al Qāsim Ḥāj Ḥamad:

'Abū al Qāsim Ḥāj Ḥamad believes that there are things, which were misunderstood in 'Ibrāhīm's offering.

1. Some of these misunderstandings occurred to Abraham himself:

⁸²Wajdi, Muḥammad Farīd (1971), *Dā'irah al-Ma'ārif Qarn al-'Ishrīn*, vol. 6, 3rd ed. Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifah, p.518.

a. He did not interpret the dream thinking that he had to make an offering because of the slaughtering sign.

b. He did not interpret sacrifice, as a sacrifice of camels because the make-up of camels is similar to the structure of the universe.

The cause of his misunderstanding is due to the type of mentality he had. He had a direct mentality, which depends on the forms of things and not what they symbolize. Even his conception of God goes through mediums. He changed his focus from full sun to full moon and then to full star, which means full completeness; and when they became incomplete, he left them all and discovered his sole God.

2. Other misunderstandings occurred to Islamist scholars such as:

a. They depended for their explanation on the Jewish tradition known for its deviation.

b. Their way of thinking depended on the general coordination of some accumulated knowledge in accordance to the cultural production of that period. The most outstanding Islamists could not exceed checking out its authenticity by means of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'adīl* or finding out the origins of its reading as al-Shāfi'ī did. None of them has attempted to uncover its epistemological system⁸³.

Now, if what Allah wanted was not a human offering, what was it then? To answer this question, the writer asserts that the following things are true facts though they contradict the Islamic tradition.

⁸³Hāj Ḥamad (1996), *al-'Ālamīyyah*, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp.85-88.

- The dream was when 'Ibrāhīm was sleeping. A dream is to be interpreted in such a way as to see its implications in reality like Yūsuf's interpretation of the king's dream and Ya'qūb's interpretation of Yūsuf's dream. A dream is not a revelation from God. Revelation from God takes place when one is awake.

- It was 'Ismā'īl -peace on him- who thought that his father's dream was God's command. (The son said: O my father! do as thou art commanded: thou will find me, if Allah so wills, one practising Patience and Constancy!) Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt: 102. Ibrahim did not say: "I was commanded" but he said, (O my son! I see in vision that I offer thee in sacrifice) Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt: 102. If his dream were God's command, this verse would be meaningless,

"Even so, in the eyes of most of the Pagans, their "partners" made alluring the slaughter of their children, in order to lead them to their own destruction, and cause confusion in their religion" Sūrah al-'An'ām: 137.

- 'Ismā'īl -peace on him- was not a child when 'Ibrāhīm had the dream. He had already reached adulthood. Allah says, (Then, when the son reached the age of serious work with him) Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt: 102 and he was mature enough to be consulted (now see what is thy view!) Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt: 102. This fact omits the double tragedy in the test, that is, Allah's asking 'Ibrāhīm's sacrifice and the fact that the offering was a child.

- Allah's call to 'Ibrāhīm using ('an ٱ) (O!) is not valueless because in the *Qur'ān* there is nothing without value. On the contrary, it attracts our attention to the fact that 'Ibrāhīm tested himself without being asked to by God. He did so to show his full submission to his God. Because of this, Allah

rewarded him: "Thou hast already fulfilled the vision! thus indeed do We reward those who do right." Sūrah al-Şāffāt: 105

- It is improbable that the slaughtered animal was a sheep. Abraham slaughtered a bull for his guest, how may God redeem 'Ibrāhīm's son with only a sheep?

What is this offering? He believes that the offering is a thanksgiving to God for His putting the universe under our service. The offering must be-therefore- an animal that has the same qualities as the universe. Only camels have these characteristics. Heaven raised up like the raising of camels, and mountains set up like the hump of camels, and the earth spread like the hoof of camels⁸⁴.

Allah says:

"Do they not look at the Camels, how they are made? And at the Sky, how it is raised high? And at the Mountains, how they are fixed firm? And at the Earth, how it is spread out?"

Sūrah al-Ghāshiyah: 17-20.

5.3.2. Assessment:

This analysis is an example of the writer's methodological contradiction and intellectual ambiguity. This is for the following reasons:

1. The writer has contradicted himself and destroyed his theory. He believes that human intellect can be divided into three phases, that is, the animist phase, the dualistic phase, and the dialectic phase. He considers 'Ibrāhīm to be the best representative of the animist phase. He contradicts this by considering that Nūḥ and his people and earlier *Bābiliyyan* civilizations had an extraordinarily creative

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp.81-85.

mentality. He believes that these civilizations "reached in their uncovered characteristics a miraculous level". He confirms that with some facts:

a. They understood the creation theory "What is the matter with you, that ye place not your hope for kindness and long-suffering in Allah, Seeing that it is He that has created you in diverse stages?" Sūrah Nūh: 13-14.

b. They were aware of the structure of the universe: "See ye not how Allah has created the seven heavens one above another" Sūrah Nūh: 15.

c. Their exact understanding of the moon's characteristics as the source of light and the sun as the source of light and heat; and that when the sun's light falls on the moon's surface, it becomes light "And made the moon a light in their midst, and made the sun as a (Glorious) Lamp?" Sūrah Nūh: 16.

d. Noah took 50 years to make the ship under his people's eyes. They did not consider that as a miracle because it was common among them. Noah had inherited other civilizations well developed like ('Ād) and (Thamūd)⁸⁵. If this was the case, why did progress move backwards when it reached 'Ibrāhīm and Mūsā and the Muslims afterwards?

2. The writer's opinion of 'Ibrāhīm is false. While Allah testified that 'Ibrāhīm was wise:

"We bestowed aforetime on Abraham his rectitude of conduct, and well were We acquainted with him. Behold! he said to his father and his people, "What are these images, to which ye are (so assiduously) devoted?"

Sūrah al-'Anbiyā': 51-52

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp.90-91.

He (Ḥāj Ḥamad) accused him of polytheism and worshipping stars. He made him suffer from uncertainty for a certain duration of time until he luckily found his sole God. He says "Even when he hopes to discover God, he saw Him in the rising sun, then, in the rising moon, then in a rising star, that is, in a complete shape. And when he rejected them, it was because of their incompleteness when the sun, the moon and the star were set"⁸⁶. 'Ibrāhīm, then, was lucky to be able to see the fading of the stars with his own eyes or else he would have died as a non-believer.

3. The writer opposed the *Qur'ān* in claiming that 'Ibrāhīm contemplated God in terms of the sun, then the moon, and then a star. This goes against the *Qur'ān's* classification of the star first, the moon second and the sun third. Allah says:

"When the night covered him over, he saw a star: he said: "This is my Lord." But when it set, he said: "I love not those that set." When he saw the moon rising in splendour, he said: "This is my Lord." But when the moon set, he said: "Unless my Lord guide me, I shall surely be among those who go astray." When he saw the sun rising in splendour, he said: "This is my Lord; this is the greatest (of all)." But when the sun set, he said: "O my people! I am indeed free from your (guilt) of giving partners to Allah."

Sūrah al-'An'ām: 76-78.

Moreover, he made the moon's eclipse, the sun's eclipse and the star's extinction as if they are synonyms and have commonalties (to him '*Ufūl* means *Kusūf*, *Khusūf* and *Ṭams*). He is not aware of this. He came with all this twisting so that he confirms his presumed hypothesis of human intellectual development to support the theory of universality that he advocates.

As for 'Ibrāhīm's story, the context indicates clearly that he mentioned the star, the moon and the sun when he was arguing with his people. His saying, (Unless

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.85.

my Lord guide me, I shall surely be among those who go astray) Sūrah al-'An'ām: 77 shows that he was using a rational and logical method to convince them. He used the same method when he destroyed their idols except the biggest one (So he broke them into pieces (all) but the biggest of them, that they might turn (and address themselves) to it) Sūrah al-'Anbiya':58. The clearest evidence to these verses,

"But when the sun set, he said: "O my people! I am indeed free from your (guilt) of giving partners to Allah. "For me, I have set my face, firmly and truly, towards Him Who created the heavens and the earth, and never shall I give partners to Allah." His people disputed with him. He said: "(Come) ye to dispute with me, about Allah, when He (Himself) hath guided me? I fear not (the beings) ye associate with Allah: unless my Lord willeth, (nothing can happen). My Lord comprehendeth in His knowledge all things. Will ye not (yourselves) be admonished? "How should I fear (the beings) ye associate with Allah, when ye fear not to give partners to Allah without any warrant having been given to you? Which of (us) two parties hath more right to security? (Tell me) if ye know. "It is those who believe and confuse not their beliefs with wrong, that are (truly) in security, for they are on (right) guidance." That was the reasoning about Us, which We gave to Abraham (to use) against his people: We raise whom We will, degree after degree: for thy Lord is full of wisdom and knowledge."

Sūrah al-'An'ām: 78-83

Where is then, the writer's understanding of the *Qur'ān* in its entirety that he keeps advocating while accusing the greatest Muslim scholars of lacking it?⁸⁷

4. Now we will discuss the prophet 'Ibrāhīm's dream that remained a confusing riddle from 'Ibrāhīm's time until nowadays when the writer revealed its (accurate) interpretation. I have some comments about this:

- a. The writer views 'Ibrāhīm as a naive person who was about to slaughter his child simply because of a dream he had, whereas, the king of Egypt is wiser

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p.508.

since he did not rush to interpret his vision. He consulted first the people around him and subsequently got the right interpretation from one of his prisoners. Is it possible that 'Ismā'īl and 'Ibrāhīm are so simple-minded as to do something done only by disbelievers? How can this opinion be compromised with God's saying "We bestowed aforetime on 'Ibrāhīm his rectitude of conduct, and well were We acquainted with him" Sūrah al-'Anbiyā': 51. Is it possible that 'Ibrāhīm would follow his dreams and intend to slaughter his son he had when he had reached old age? "Praise be to Allah. Who hath granted unto me in old age Isma'īl and Isaac: for truly my Lord is He, the Hearer of Prayer!" Sūrah 'Ibrāhīm: 39?

b. The writer admits that 'Ibrāhīm's vision was not revelation. However, he contradicts this by saying, "it is clear that Allah had requested an offering"⁸⁸. How could dreams turn into God's request? And since the Egyptian King's dream was equal to that of 'Ibrāhīm, doesn't this mean that he was also a prophet too? And since Allah requested something through 'Ibrāhīm's dream, it would entail that Allah had a request from the king's dream.

c. The writer says that Allah interfered to redeem 'Ismā'īl. Why, then, did not He interfere to save the disbelievers' sons. Doesn't this imply a lack of fairness according to the writer's methodology.

d. What confirms that 'Ibrāhīm's dream - peace on him - is a revelation from God is Allah's saying (And remember that Abraham was tried by his Lord with certain commands, which he fulfilled) Sūrah al-Baqarah: 124. What are

⁸⁸*Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.84.

the commands that Allah tried 'Ibrāhīm with if they do not include slaughtering his son? As 'Ibn 'Āshūr says: "probably among them the command to slaughter his son, the command for him to be circumcised, the command to migrate with Hājir to a remote place and the greatest one is the command to slaughter his son - 'Ismā'īl - by a revelation of God during his dream. Allah has called that a trial in His saying (For this was obviously a trial) Sūrah al-Şāffat: 106⁸⁹.

5.4. THE STORY OF MOSES.

5.4.1. Shuḥrūr:

Shuḥrūr believes that the story of Moses with the good slave is among the most important stories. He warned against a shallow understanding of it. The story aims to teach us how to behave in relation to universal and social laws. "We have explained in detail in this Qur'ān, for the benefit of mankind, every kind of similitude: but man is, in most things, contentious." Sūrah al-Kahf: 54.

It does not have any amusement, assurance or superstition functions. This story, according to him, is a lecture to us showing the difference between human legislation to achieve human justice and God's legislation to achieve God's justice⁹⁰. According to him, it is man who

"creates legislation to organize relations between the members of a society. However, this legislation has its own limitations. They cannot suit each individual separately. In this story, the

⁸⁹ 'Ibn 'Āshūr, *al-Taḥrīr*, *op. cit.*, vol.1, p.703.

⁹⁰ Shuḥrūr, Muḥammad (1994), *Dirāsāt 'Islāmiyyah Mu'āşirah fī al-Dawlah wa al-Mujtama*, 1st ed. Damascus: Dār al-'Ahāfi, pp.107-108.

representative of legislation is Moses-peace on him- his legislation contains human and social guidance that no society could do without or else it would be destroyed. However, it does not contain God's absolute justice even if it came from God. It organizes relations between individuals and between communities exactly like the human legislation and laws organize them"⁹¹.

Justice, then, is relative. To achieve it, concrete evidence is required. Thus "legislation applications are characterized by relativism. It applies thoroughly to a certain group of people and does not provide justice for each individual"⁹².

The writer afterwards wonders that if both humans' and God's legislation, though they are characterized by addressing the society as a whole and require concrete evidence for their application that shows that something has been done and is not only alleged, what is the criterion that could guarantee justice for everyone when this evidence is missing? And what are the criteria in this case?⁹³ The writer answers by affirming that it is "God's absolute justice which works above the law and legislation and which -along with its circumstances- cannot be fully grasped by any individual or society"⁹⁴. The writer afterwards tries to distinguish between the concept of absolute justice which is eternal and one of God's attributes and His good names, and between its application that is circumstantial and which is related to each individual's circumstances and environment. This distinction, according to the writer, is crucial because without it we fall in the belief that Allah had imposed everything from the beginning of creation. And thus we deprive Man of his will. This will lead him to pessimism and complete dependence⁹⁵.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, p.108.

⁹²*Ibid.*

⁹³*Ibid.*, pp.108-109.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p.109.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*

The rule that the writer wants to assert and based on which we can understand the story of Moses with the good slaves is that "God's justice is absolute and eternal. It applies to each individual separately in his relation to his circumstances and others"⁹⁶. According to this rule, Moses was sent to represent general legislation that had to be applied to all the people regardless of the special circumstances surrounding each individual. Because if we looked at each individual, we could have unlimited special cases that cannot be dealt with based on the law. For this, Allah commands us not to judge unless we are sure that an incident had already occurred. However, this method cannot achieve absolute justice, for this reason, God's justice exists: "And the Firmament has He raised high, and He has set up the Balance (of Justice)" Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 7.

Therefore, the good slave represents God's justice

"which no one has the right to interfere with -because he is unable to do so- or else it would lead certainly to the complete destruction of the society and we would go back to the law of the jungle. (This is) because God's justice in the law of the jungle is absolute...and these laws are characterized by objectivity. It carries truth and justice (*watammāt kalimatu rabbika sidqan wa 'adlan la mubaddila li kalimātih*) Sūrah al-'An'ām: 115"⁹⁷

For individual relationships, Allah has devised Laws and so did humans. For this, Moses said to the good slave: "May I follow thee, on the footing that thou teach me something of the (Higher) Truth which thou hast been taught?" Sūrah al-Kahf: 66. And the latter answered him. He said: "Verily thou wilt not be able to have patience with me! And how canst thou have patience about things about which thy

⁹⁶*Ibid.*

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, p.111.

understanding is not complete?" Sūrah al-Kahf: 67-68⁹⁸. The writer attempts to provide an understanding of the story that could support his conclusion and his previously mentioned rule. He says: "let's move to verse 71 which shows the first case, the case of the ship 'So they both proceeded: until, when they were in the boat, he scuttled it. Said Moses: Hast thou scuttled it in order to drown those in it? Truly, a strange thing hast thou done!' (Sūrah al-Kahf: 71). We can deduce three things: The boarding of the ship, the making of the hole in the ship and Moses' disapproval"⁹⁹.

Moses' disapproval represents the position of the state and the Law and the court. Therefore, he rejected his making a hole in the ship as this is against the Laws, whereas, the slave's harm of the ship represents God's absolute justice in detail. Even if the damaging of the ship saved it from being taken by the king, it is impossible for human laws to follow this logic because of the limitations of human knowledge and because accepting such rules would mean its end.

It is important to note that God's justice guides our life daily. Some people call it good luck while others call it chance. And because this justice is involved in so many things, it is not possible to impose a framework and have a clear perspective of it. By keeping this in mind, we could also understand the story of the killing of the lad

"Then they proceeded: until, when they met a young man, he slew him. Moses said: Hast thou slain an innocent person who had slain none? Truly a foul (unheard-of) thing hast thou done!"

Sūrah al-Kahf: 74.

It contains three elements: The meeting of the young boy, the killing of the young boy by the good slave and Moses' disapproval.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, pp.111-112.

Moses represents the state's opinion that has the function of applying the Law according to concrete evidence. It deals with the appearance of things and does not interfere in other things. While the role of the good slave is to give solace to the suffering man and to assure him of the existence of God's justice, and that God loves him and does not hate him. Those who accept God's justice will win over his calamity and those who challenge it will die in sadness and debt. The last story between Moses and the good slave is the story of the wall. Allah says,

"Then they proceeded: until, when they came to the inhabitants of a town, they asked them for food, but they refused them hospitality. They found there a wall on the point of falling down, but he set it up straight. (Moses) said: "If thou hadst wished, surely thou couldst have exacted some recompense for it!"

Sūrah al-Kahf: 77.

This verse also contains three elements: The wall was ready to fall, the repair of the wall without reward and Moses' disapproval.

Moses' opinion is the opinion of the state that does not allow the employment of another man without rewarding him, while the good slave represents God's justice, which rewards good work even by benefiting the offspring. The author derives from these three cases the following lessons:

1. When someone is unable to get back his rights or the Laws have failed to do so, he should trust in God's justice and his accurate judgement.
2. It is compulsory to protest against injustice and everything that goes against the Laws. Or else this would cause the destruction of society and Man would lose his right to defend his rights. This could lead to chaos, apparent injustice and superstition under the pretext that we should wait for God's justice or that it is God who wanted this to happen to us.

3. We should not measure God's justice based on human justice because this may lead us to believe that God is unjust. Whereas, in the case we use what we believe in God's justice in dealing with human relations, confusion would spread while punishment and reward would lose their meaning. This is exactly the lesson we should derive from the story of Moses and the good slave. When we criticize some of the prophet's companions, we in fact use our human judgement but their going to paradise is the choice of God¹⁰⁰.

5.4.2. Assessment:

It is most suitable to describe Shuḥrūr's writing with what Fu'ād Zakariyyā said about Ḥasan Ḥanafī. He described the negative impact of Ḥasan Ḥanafī's writing on the reader as a result of the great number of contradictions it contains. He expressed his doubt about "the reader's ability to keep his mental ability safe after he dances with our writer in a crazy circle of contradictions in which his treatment of the topic moves around"¹⁰¹.

We feel that this description applies well to Shuḥrūr's writing. In addition to this, he has two more weaknesses that Ḥanafī's writing lacks: first, his use of language lacks proficiency and second, his ideas are not complete. This causes the reader to feel not only a headache but also boredom and dizziness. To show this, here are some examples:

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.112-116.

¹⁰¹ Zakariyyā, Fu'ād, *Mustaqbal al-'Usūliyyah: Baḥṭh Naqdī fī Ḍaw' Dirāsah li al-Duktūr Ḥanafī*, Majallah al-Fikr, No. 4, December 1984, p.17. Taken from: George Ṭarābishī (1991), *al-Muthaqqafūn al-'Arab wa al-Turāth*. Al-Taḥlīl al-Nafsī li 'Uṣāb Jamā'ī, 1st ed. London: Riyād al-Rāyis for books and publication, p.105.

1. The authors' contradictions: if we wanted to mention all the writer's contradictions, we would need many pages to do so. For the sake of brevity we will mention a few examples only:

- a. Human legislation is to achieve human justice while God's legislation aims at achieving God's justice. Moses' laws belonged then to God's legislation. The writer agrees with this. However, he made it stand for human legislation.
- b. He asserts that human legislation organizes relationships between individuals, communities and states. This contradicts his statement that this legislation is incapable of covering the relations between individuals.
- c. Human legislation does not have the right to interfere in God's justice because being ignorant of it; any interference would cause the total destruction of society and bring us back to the law of the jungle. This contradicts his statement that God's justice is absolute and eternal and its application concerns each individual in relation to his circumstances and to other people. He warns us of the danger of trying to apply God's justice and on the other hand, he deems God's justice to be necessary for human life.
- d. God's justice is absolute and above the Law. No man or society could grasp it or its circumstances. This contradicts his assertion that God's justice is objective and carries truth and justice. This entails that it could be grasped. Therefore, each individual has to deal with it according to his circumstances.
- e. When human laws are unable to achieve justice for each individual, God's justice is the measure that gives every individual his rights. This contradicts his comment that to apply God's justice would lead to chaos, injustice and destruction of the state. The logical conclusion of this is the fact that God's

justice does not give the individual rights, and that it leads to chaos and is not suitable for the establishment of the state and the society.

f. If a man is unable to get back his rights or the legislation is unable to do so, he has to trust God's justice, which is the main solace for the people. Those who accept their calamity would overcome it and those who did not accept it, they will die in debt and agony. This is contradicted by his saying that we should protest against injustice and all things against the Law. Failing to do so under the pretext of seeking God's justice would cause the destruction of the state.

g. Among the things repeated by the writer is his assertion that God's justice is eternal and that it covers details. He says: "The measure of the Lord of the Worlds is exact and does not leave any minor thing"¹⁰². This entails the eternity of God's knowledge because it is not logical to have justice in detail except if there is knowledge about it. However, in his book "The book and the *Qur'ān*", we find that he denies that God knows the details. He says:

If Allah's knowledge includes what Zayd will do in his conscious life, and the choices Zayd will make from the time he becomes able to choose and until he dies, the question will be why He left him since He knew he will do that? We here so that to justify such this thing, we will twist and turn saying that God knew from eternity that 'Abū Lahab will be a non-believer and that 'Abū Bakr would be a believer. Then, we add that 'Abū Lahab had chosen to be a non-believer while 'Abū Bakr had chosen to be a believer. This thesis will not leave any meaning to mature human choice. It makes it God's comedy of some kind no matter how we try to justify it.¹⁰³

¹⁰²Shuḥrūr (1994), *op. cit.*, p114.

¹⁰³Shuḥrūr (1990), *op. cit.*, p.389.

In addition to his contradiction that destroys what he wants to affirm, he revealed a certain simple-mindedness that makes us wonder how we could explain this to him. Or in Māhir al-Munajjid's terms "We do not know how to simplify the issue for him so that he could understand"¹⁰⁴. The fact that the teacher knows that one of his students will fail in the exams does not imply forcing him to fail. "Knowledge is a revealing quality and not an influencing one. This fact is known. The writer should not be ignorant of it"¹⁰⁵. Even if we assume that God's knowledge is mathematical, probable and predictive¹⁰⁶, this won't solve the issue of compulsion thought by the author because it is supposed that the probabilities that Zayd will fall into are equal to forcing him to choose one of them.

However, to say that God's knowledge is probable, will lead to our belief that God may make mistakes and may commit injustice. According to this theory, the best-expected result is God's possibility to make a mistake between one percent and five percent. This percentage is the one generally accepted in human, social and economic science¹⁰⁷. Allah - glory to Him - is above all this.

2. He lacks proficiency and his ideas are incomplete. It is not hard for the reader of Shuhrūr's books to notice this. His ideas are interrupted which makes it hard to distinguish the beginning of the sentence from its end. In addition to this, he switches between standard Arabic language with the Syrian dialect. At other

¹⁰⁴ al-Munajjid (1994), *op. cit.*, p.130.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p.131.

¹⁰⁶ Shuhrūr (1990), *op. cit.*, p.389.

¹⁰⁷ Rae R. Newton & Kjell Rudenstam (1999), *Your Statistical Consultant*. USA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp.69-71.

times, he adds some English expressions without any need for them. For example, he says:

"If Zayd goes to kill 'Amr, and he is knocked down (*dahasathu*) by a car when he reaches and 'Amr sees the accident (*ḥādithah al-dahs*), and he does not know that Allah has saved him from death, he will try to catch the driver of the car and will hand him to the police, because he knocked down (*dahasa*) Zayd. But if he knows that the victim (*madhus*) is coming to kill him, he will ask the police to let the car driver go. The police will not believe his story, even if he shows the evidence; and the driver will be punished because the accident (*dahs*) happens while the murder does not occur."¹⁰⁸

a. He used the Syrian word (*dahasa*) to mean to be knocked down by a car.

Notice the lack of proficiency in his language. It is incomprehensible how and from which dictionary; he got the word (*dahasa*) a colloquial word that means (knock down) - and its derivations.

b. What is the grammatical function of (when) and whether the first sentence ends in (arrive) or (the car) and whether the pronoun in (knock him) and (save him) refers to the 'Amr or Zayd? And who is the person who is knocked down? And does the pronoun in (killed him) refer to the driver or to whom?

The second example is his statement "We have to understand the two following rules, that is: *"revelation does not contradict reason and revelation does not contradict reality"*¹⁰⁹ - The italicized sentence is written in English instead of Arabic - the reader does not know why he has to include the English translation and what type of clarity this might contribute. Maybe he wanted to scare the reader.

¹⁰⁸Shuḥrūr (1994), *op. cit.*, pp.109-110.

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*, p.194.

5.4.3. 'Abu al-Qāsim Ḥāj:

Abu al-Qāsim Ḥāj, on the other hand, believes that God chose Moses -peace on him- to live the experience of seeing the actual application of the unseen in world events. The story of Moses and the good slave as shown in Sūrah al-Kahf is not a normal story but basically a philosophical analysis of the role and existence of God in human behavior. Moses was the main target of this story because his faith before Allah's choosing him as his messenger was influenced by the values of Egyptian civilization. Allah says: (Pharaoh said: Did we not cherish thee as a child among us, and didst thou not stay in our midst many years of thy life?) Sūrah al-Shu'arā': 18.

When Moses -peace on him- became a prophet, he led his people to a historical turning point, that is, they left Egypt. Because the basis of Moses' mentality at that phase was the knowledge of God through His miraculous deeds and concrete fulfillment of His will, Moses needed a different type of understanding to be able to deal with the new phase in which he had to deal directly with the unseen without any direct address from God. He needed an understanding, which would enable him to relate the events with their background in the unseen world. His experience with the good slave was actually a concrete experience that helped him to grasp the relationship between our world and the unseen world. The good slave draws Moses' attention to the difficulty of understanding the real nature of things from God. When he said, (And how canst thou have patience about things about which thy understanding is not complete?) Sūrah al-Kahf: 68. Moses' experience with the good slave is through three events. They are as follows: The making of the hole in the ship, the killing of the boy and the construction of the wall.

Moses' disapproval was because he thought that making a hole in the ship would cause its owner to drown, that it was wrong to kill the boy for no reason and that it was a waste of time to construct the wall for unkind people. The good slave explained that though spoiling the ship seemed to be wrong, it would actually make the ship safe from being taken by the king. His killing the boy is actually a mercy to his parents, and his construction of the wall was aimed at preserving the treasure. If he had not done so, the wall would have fallen at the time of their arrival and the wicked villagers would have seen the treasure and would have taken it. This is a good lesson that shows Allah's mercy and care.

What can be learned from these three experiences is the understanding of invisibility and existence at the same time, that is, God is invisible but, at the same time, present in its making and controls its consequences. This is what Moses needed to understand. Undoubtedly, it is not easy to come up with a methodology to deal with such events. However, to understand the wisdom of God's will and its manifestation in the occurrence of events should not be limited to some specific examples, which can provide us with absolute and general rules. In fact, we could generalize our understanding of one example to other examples. This is exactly what the good slave did when he chose the events that suited the phases in which Mūsā -peace on him- had lived¹¹⁰. God mentioned these three phases in Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 7- 29.

1. The first experience is about the ship and the king who used to take every ship by force: It resembles the phase when Mūsā was in the cradle and his mother

¹¹⁰ Hāj Hamad (1996), *al-'Ālamiyyah*, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp.383-392.

threw him into the sea. At that time, the Pharaoh ordered the killing of every Israelite child.

2. The second experience is the killing of the boy, which seemed to Mūsā to be done for no reason: It resembles Mūsā's striking the Egyptian, which led to his death. The good slave is innocent of the killing of the boy and so is Mūsā in his killing of the Egyptian. Mūsā is not fully responsible for what he did.

3. The third experience is the construction of the wall which resembles, in terms of timing, Mūsā's arrival in *Madyan's* water. Mūsā reached *Madyan* to find two girls pushing away their ships, whereas Mūsā and the good slave reached there to find the wall about to fall.

It is noticeable that the consequences of man's acts, when controlled by God's invisible power, do not lead necessarily to our expected results¹¹¹. This is exactly what happened to Mūsā (Moses) during his life and what he noticed in his experience with the good slave. The writer asserts that " The philosophical value of Mūsā's experience lies in its denial of coincidence which leads man to understand the element of timing and this is an exact science that has a crucial significance in the objective activity as well as in God's acts".¹¹²

5.4.4. Assessment:

We had already shown the authors' methodological contradictions in his writing regarding the history of the phases of human intellect development. There is no need to repeat them. It is sufficient to clarify here one important issue, which the writer himself has warned of. It is the devaluation of the human act. He says: " The lack of a

¹¹¹*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp.392-398.

¹¹²*Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp.404-405.

methodology to understand the *Qur'ān* resulted in shedding negative meanings on man's attitude towards his deeds".¹¹³

Although the author blames strongly the people in the past, describing them as being ignorant incapable and have shallow understanding¹¹⁴, he adopts clearly the denomination of the fatalism. He says:

The Law of nature denies the Law of the unseen and refers to thorough scientific methodology, which believes in its concrete tools in research, whereas, the law of the unseen does not deny the law of nature but controls it within its hold in such a way that the law of the earth cannot reveal it. This is because it happens away from its (the law of nature) criteria. Still, it happens within its time and its place with an invisible power that we cannot find an explanation for.¹¹⁵

Afterwards, he poses the question "How does this thing happen when the unseen dominates outside the visible circle? How does the unseen become a reality to Man?"¹¹⁶ Immediately, he starts telling the story of the good slave and Moses comparing it with other experiences that happened to Moses leading us to conclude that Moses is irresponsible for doing what he did. He even blames him for doing so. He says: "if Moses had thought back about this happening in his experience with the good slave, he would have known that that killing was fated, and that Allah had designed it in such a way as to make it happen without making Moses truly responsible for it".¹¹⁷ With this mentality, all the scientific criteria weaken and we enter the unknown realm of the revelations. "Undoubtedly, the recognition of this thing requires deep thinking in a special way because it is difficult to come with a

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p.419.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.383.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.396.

methodology that defines the way of acquisition"¹¹⁸. Therefore, the oppression and humiliation of societies, the colonization of Palestine by Israel and the Arabs bowing to it becomes God's fate and His timing¹¹⁹

If this is the case of the verses related to the unknown and belief, what about the other verses related to practical and legislative issues? This is what we are going to analyze in the next chapter.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.392.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p.48.